



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/605,211	09/15/2003	Alex Spector	001-230	2210
29569	7590	06/20/2007		
FURR LAW FIRM 2622 DEBOLT ROAD UTICA, OH 43080			EXAMINER WEINTROP, ADAM S	
			ART UNIT 2145	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/20/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/605,211	Applicant(s) SPECTOR ET AL.	
	Examiner Adam.S. Weintrop	Art Unit 2109	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 12-14 and 16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10 and 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The title placed on the first page of the specification contains electronic formatting "[Insert title of invention]". This needs to be removed from the title field.

In section 0029, there are typographical errors with "Al l" and "basis3s".

Corrections of these errors are required.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

2. **Claims 1-16** are objected to because of the following informalities:

Regarding **claim 1**, the phrase "said client computer" of lines 8-9 has not been defined and should be replaced with --a client computer-- to improve the clarity of the claim. The phrase "host software" on line 13 has already been defined and should be replaced with --said host software-- to improve the clarity of the claim. The term "said database with links" on line 17 should be replaced with --said database of links-- to clarify the claim language. The term "said host computers" on lines 5-6 on page 2 is plural and should be replaced with --said host computer-- to clarify the claim language. The term "a network protocol" on line 8 should be replaced with --the network protocol-- as it has already been defined to improve the clarity of the claim. The term "a

transport protocol" on line 22 should be replaced with --the transport protocol-- has it has already been defined to improve the clarity of the claim.

Regarding **claim 3**, the term "the client software program" on lines 3-4 has not been defined and should be replaced with --a client software program-- to improve the clarity of the claim. The word "claims" in line 1 should be --claim--.

Regarding **claims 5-10, and 15-16**, the claims depend on multiple claims. They need to depend on claims in the alternative only, therefore the claims depended upon need to be in the format of --claims 1, 2, 3, or 4--, --claims 5, 6, 7, 8, or 9--, --claims 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, or 14--, or --claims 1 or 3--, respectively.

3. **Claims 10 and 15** are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims have not been further treated on the merits.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. **Claims 3-4** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding **claim 3**, the claim recites: "wherein a single computer serves are both said client computer and said host computer". This sentence is confusing, vague, and indefinite, as it is unclear what is meant, if the single computer serves both said client computer and said host computer, or a single computer serves as both said client computer and said host computer.

Regarding **claim 4**, the claim recites: "wherein there is a plurality of single computers, thus achieving scalability and better performance". The claim is vague and indefinite as it is unclear what is meant by "better performance". This is a subjective term of degree.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 1-9, 11-12, and 16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryu et al. (US 5,634,048) in view of Robotham et al. (US 6,704,024).

Regarding **claim 1**, Ryu et al. teaches:

An on-demand electronic document processing and sharing network comprising:

- (a) a server computer (column 9, lines 13-37, where the center system is seen as a server since it manages the shared data centrally),
- (b) a host computer (column 9, lines 51-54, where terminal 1C contains data that is requested to be shared, seen as hosting data, or a host computer),
- (c) a server software application installed on said server computer (column 9, lines 34-37, where the center system does the function of managing the distributed data, seen as a server software application),
- (d) a host software application installed on said client computer (column 9, lines 51-54, where the terminal that is located can send the data out, seen as host software),
- (e) shared electronic documents stored on the host computer (column 9, lines 4-7, where the terminals store shared databases),
- (f) said server software application comprises
 - a. a method of communication with host software application on the host computer via a network protocol (column 9, lines 29-30, where a terminal becomes the center system and communicates with other terminals, seen as hosts, and these terminals are connected through a network as seen in column 1, lines 11-14, and this communication must happen over a network protocol),
 - b. A database of links to electronic documents stored on the host computer (column 9, lines 4-12, where all the retrieval information about data on terminals is stored on the center system, seen as links to documents on the host computer),

Art Unit: 2109

c. An updating means to update said database with links to the electronic documents received from the host computer via said method of communication (column 9, lines 31-36, where the terminals, or host computers, send retrieval information to the central system, and it stores them in the link file)

d. A viewer interface providing means to find the links stored in said database and request the electronic documents from the host computer (column 9, lines 38-44 and lines 52-54, where the center system receives request for data, then the center system locates the data based on the links previously stored and this information is used to request the data from the located terminal)

(g) a host software application installed on said host computers, which comprises

a. a method of communication with server software application on the server computer via a network protocol (column 9, lines 31-35, where the host terminals send communications to the central system and these terminals are connected through a network as seen in column 1, lines 11-14, and these communications must happen over a network protocol),

b. A monitoring means to monitor and register changes to the electronic documents stored on the host computer (column 10, lines 32-34, where the host must monitor and register changes to the data, since after an update, it sends the update to the central system)

c. A notification means to notify the server computer software application about such changes to electronic documents via said method of communication (column 10, lines 32-34, where the central system is updated about changes to data),

Art Unit: 2109

e. A delivery interface providing means to deliver the original or transformed electronic documents directly to viewer via a transport protocol (column 9, lines 52-54, where the requesting terminal receives and displays the data), wherein a viewer connects to the server computer to find the links to the electronic documents (column 9, lines 38-40, where a request for data from a terminal is seen as a viewer connecting to a server to find documents).

Ryu et al. does not teach:

The server software comprising:

e. The viewer interface provides means to directly or indirectly choose viewing preferences, which along with the request for the electronic documents sent to the host computer, or

The host software application comprising:

d. A manipulation means to manipulate electronic documents by transformation of size, dimensions or content, using applicable existing document transformation algorithms, according to the viewing preferences received from the server software application via said method of communication, or

The delivery interface that can:

Specify the viewing preferences, according to which the electronic documents is automatically processed on the client computer and delivered through said communications method directly from the host computer to said viewer.

The general concept of choosing viewing preferences along with a request for a shared document, and then manipulating the document accordingly on the client computer when it is received from the host is well known in the art as illustrated by Robotham et al. Robotham et al. teaches a document processing system using a client and a server, where the client can request documents, and this request can be coupled with information regarding the display preferences (column 19, lines 37-53, where device information can be collected from the client in a variety of ways, one way being appending it with every request). Robotham et al. also teaches manipulating the documents according to the viewing preferences (column 20, lines 1-4, where the server determines expected display attributes and column 23, lines 49-56, where the manipulation uses the expected display attributes to transform the data). Robotham et al. also teaches the server can send the transformed data to the client (column 26, lines 65-column 27, line 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Ryu et al. with using client viewing preferences and server side manipulation of data as taught by Robotham et al. in order to optimize transcoding, which is a technology used for converting a document into a document formatted for a specific type of display, by reducing time and cost associated with keeping multiple versions of the same content as noted in Robotham et al.'s disclosure in column 3, lines 1-3.

Art Unit: 2109

Regarding **claim 2**, Ryu et al. and Robotham et al. teach all of the limitations as described above, with Ryu et al. further teaching a system as recited in claim 1 wherein there is a plurality of client computers (column 2, lines 7-10, with more than one terminal containing data registered in the distributed data system).

Regarding **claim 3**, Ryu et al. and Robotham et al. teach all of the limitations as described above, with Ryu et al. further teaching a system as recited in claims 2 wherein a single computer serves as both said client computer and said host computer with both the server software program and the client software program and can function as a client computer and process electronic documents (column 13, lines 19-29, where a terminal first searches the keyword links located in the same terminal, and this is seen as a single computer being a client and a host since it can request data and serve its own data, and also can be a server since it checks the links for retrieval purposes and then processes the documents by receiving the documents).

Regarding **claim 4**, Ryu et al. and Robotham et al. teach all of the limitations as described above with Ryu et al. further teaching a system as recited in claim 3 wherein there is a plurality of single computers, thus achieving scalability and better performance (column 2, lines 7-10, with more than one terminal containing data registered in the distributed data system, and they can perform the function as described above in reference to claim 3).

Art Unit: 2109

Regarding **claims 5-9**, Ryu et al. and Robotham et al. teach all of the limitations as described above, however Ryu et al. does not teach using the system will images, videos, texts, audio, or any special format where applicable transformation rules are defined and implemented on the client computer. The general concept of using these content types in any distributed data system is well known in the art as illustrated by Robotham et al. Robotham et al. further teaches a system as recited in claims 1, 2, 3, 4 wherein the electronic document is a digital image, a system as recited in claims 1, 2, 3, 4 wherein the electronic document is a digital video file, a system as recited in claims 1, 2, 3, 4 wherein the electronic document is a text document, and a system as recited in claims 1, 2, 3, 4 wherein the electronic document is a digital audio file (column 56, lines 30-47, with the rendering functions determined based on content type, and the content transferred is represented as bitmaps, seen as digital images, and the content can also be word processing documents, seen as texts, video, or any streaming content, which can include audio as the definition of streaming content includes audio as noted in "Streaming Content" definition provided by "ComputerHope.com", further any of these types are of a special format and transformation rules can exists on the client as noted in column 19, lines 37-53, where device information can be collected from the client and column 20, lines 1-4, where the server determines expected display attributes and column 23, lines 49-56, where the manipulation uses the expected display attributes to transform the data). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Ryu et al. with using these content types as taught by

Art Unit: 2109

Robotham et al. in order to adapt any content to work with the system, therefore making the system more compatible.

Regarding **claims 11-12**, Ryu et al. and Robotham et al. teach all of the limitations as described above, however Ryu et al. does not teach using SOAP as a protocol and a Web Service as a method of communication, or HTTP as the transport protocol and HTTP download as the method of communication. The general concept of using HTTP or SOAP as protocols in a data communication environment and using HTTP download or any web service as a method of communication is well known in the art as illustrated by Robotham et al. Robotham et al. teaches that SOAP can be used to communicate between the client and server (column 17, lines 53-55), and HTTP can be used for data transmitting (column 27, lines 53-60). Robotham et al. also teaches that the data can be distributed via a web service or HTTP download (column 27, lines 49-60, where data transmitted down to the client over HTTP is seen as HTTP download for the method of communication, and this is a web service, as the client interfaces with the server over a web browser as noted in column 9, lines 46-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Ryu et al. with using these protocols and services as taught by Robotham et al. in order to optimize transcoding, which is a technology used for converting a document into a document formatted for a specific type of display, by reducing time and cost associated with keeping multiple versions of the same content as noted in Robotham et al.'s disclosure

in column 3, lines 1-3.

Regarding **claim 16**, Ryu et al. and Robotham et al. teach all of the limitations as described above, however Ryu et al. does not teach using a cache on any number of host computers, which is used to send multiple copies of the same processed document to more than one spectator. The general concept of using a cache for a document delivery system is well known in the art as illustrated by Robotham et al. Robotham et al. teaches a cache to store processed documents for delivery to similar clients (column 44, lines 5-22, with caching implemented in the server). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Ryu et al. with using a cache as taught by Robotham et al. in order to increase the speed of delivery of similar content as noted in Robotham et al.'s disclosure in column 44, lines 13-18.

8. **Claims 13-14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryu et al. (US 5,634,048) and Robotham et al. (US 6,704,024) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Yau et al. (US 7,155,487).

Regarding **claims 13-14**, Ryu et al. and Robotham et al. teach all of the limitations as described above except for using FTP protocol as the protocol and FTP download as the method of communication, or providing directory browsing using FTP protocol. The general concept of using FTP with a distributed data system is well known in the art as illustrated by Yau et al. Yau et al. teaches a distributed data system

Art Unit: 2109

where the client request data over FTP (column 8, lines 22-39, where the transfer is done over HTTP or can be modified to be FTP and the downloaded data is send over FTP, seen as the method of communication). Accordingly, FTP modified from HTTP provides its users a directory-browsing interface (as seen in the FTP definition "FTP" from "techterms.org", where a listing of all the files in the directory occurs with a FTP session, seen as providing directory browsing capabilities to the viewer). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Ryu et al. and Robotham et al. with using FTP and directory browsing as taught by Yau et al. in order to effectively share data to multiple recipients as noted in Yau et al.'s disclosure in column 2, lines 30-34, and also to use well known protocols in transferring data to make the system more compatible.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam S. Weintrop whose telephone number is 571-270-1604. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on 571-272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AW 5/24/07


JASON CARDONE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER